

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an application which is a 371 of an pct application. The priority is denied because it appears to be more than three years.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a **separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is not on a separate sheet of paper and appears to be more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 14-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The following claims are vague, indefinite, awkwardly, and confusingly worded:

- i. “waste receptacle is in fluid communication” in claim 14 and claim 30. This is only true when there is water in the apparatus. Applicant should define invention in terms of the structure and not the fluid. This language is awkwardly worded.
- ii. “may be” in claim 26. The limitation must be positively recited.

b. Regarding claim 26, the phrase "for example" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 14-18 and 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dahl (2004/0237243A1).

Dahl discloses a device as recited in claims 14-17 and 22 and 33. Dahl discloses a mopping trolley having a carriage (137), a mop press (133), two receptacles (10clean&26&40 waste), discharge (124),

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahl (2004/0237243A1) in view of Baek (3504392).

c. Dahl discloses the claimed invention except for side by side(in the same plane. Note this is what the examiner thinks the applicant meant. This is why the 103 is being applied as well as a 102.) The claim would have been obvious because the substitution of one carriage bottom having side by side receptacles for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 19-20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3723

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The 892 form discloses prior art being made of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE D. WILSON whose telephone number is 571-272-4499. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOSEPH HAIL can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ldw

/LEE D WILSON/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3723

Application/Control Number: 10/510,462
Art Unit: 3723

Page 6

April 15, 2008